

## **London Borough of Newham response to the consultation on the Draft New London Plan 2018**

### **Introduction**

London is moving east, and Newham is set to play a key role in the capital's future growth – both in terms of population growth, economic growth, and the delivery of new housing. The borough is home to major development sites, including in: Stratford and the Olympic Park; Custom House and Canning Town; and the Royal Docks, where we work closely with the GLA in the capital's only Enterprise Zone. By 2027, we expect that £27bn will have been invested in the borough, delivering tens of thousands of new homes and thousands of new jobs.

The Council are working hard to ensure that the benefits of this growth are shared by all residents across the borough, and that this development is sustainable and reflects the principles of 'good growth'. Our draft Local Plan clearly sets out our approach to achieve this, including ambitious targets for housebuilding and place shaping to ensure that Newham continues to develop as a place where people choose to live, work and stay.<sup>1</sup>

On many points, we support the ambition set out in the draft London Plan, and believe that it is complementary to our local plans, particularly in terms of supporting Good Growth, protecting strategically important employment land, promoting new industries, securing affordable housing and setting an ambitious environmental agenda.

In particular, we welcome and share the Mayor of London's aspiration to significantly increase housing delivery. We are determined to play a leading role in delivering the homes that London needs, and recognise that this must be achieved alongside the delivery of jobs and essential supporting infrastructure. However, specific concerns remain over the methodology used to arrive at Newham's substantially increased target (set out in our response to H1 and H2), and we consider that this policy in its current form poses a significant risk to both local and regional planning frameworks, and in turn LBN's ability to deliver sustainable development through a plan-led process.

It is important to note that the only way to deliver the increased supply required is through a substantial increase in public investment. All the evidence shows that the private sector alone – driven by market trends rather than housing need – will not deliver what is required. Indeed, in recent years, with the market at its peak, London has continued to fall behind the targets in

---

<sup>1</sup>See:

<https://www.newham.gov.uk/Documents/Council%20and%20Democracy/LocalPlanReviewProposedSubmissionReg19.pdf>

the previous London plan, let alone the substantially increased targets in the new draft Plan.

Newham already sees one the highest levels of housing delivery in London, including the second highest number of homes for social rent.<sup>2</sup> However, we know that more needs to be done. We will substantially step up our own delivery through council-owned housing vehicles, such as Red Door Ventures, and through regeneration on council-owned sites. However, without a similar increase in investment from elsewhere, there are limits to what boroughs can achieve. If the required public investment does not materialise, it is crucial that the Plan's policies are framed so that they retain a focus on quality and on family homes, and do not allow poorly designed, sub-standard housing to be built by default, just to get closer to targets. Such an approach would risk the principles of 'good growth'.

The following sections of this paper set out our response to each section of the draft London Plan in detail. We also support the response submitted by the wider Local London sub-region, of which Newham is a member.

## **Chapter 1: Good Growth**

### **Policy GG1 – Building strong and inclusive communities**

London Borough of Newham (LBN) support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy GG2: Making the best use of land**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, LBN object to Paragraph B, as a one size fits-all design-led approach to intensification is not sufficient and the London Plan should recognise the roles Local Plans need to play in spatially directing the densest/tallest of development to the most suitable locations as well as setting further standards (e.g. indicative heights), as indeed is implied by tall buildings policy D8.

As representations recently received by LBN at Reg. 19 of the Local Plan Review show, developers are using the draft London Plan design-led intensification impetus as an excuse to reduce development of Strategic Sites to planning by numbers and essentially 'housing-led', in spite of strong strategic evidenced need for other types of development in different forms, including employment space and significant open space.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mayor of London (2017) *Housing in London: 2017. The evidence base for the Mayor's Housing Strategy*. Available here: <https://files.datapress.com/london/dataset/housing-london/2017-01-26T18:50:00/Housing-in-London-2017-report.pdf>

Additionally, given the drive to intensify development within London's boundaries, good growth policy must address the need for strategic Green Belt Review. Without this, policy will continue to direct development to other locations where it could be less sustainable due to increased pressures on already over-stretched infrastructure capacity and air quality impacts.

### **Policy GG3: Creating a healthy city**

LBN are supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, LBN question the effectiveness and consistency of Paragraph E. It is not always appropriate to incentivise build out, particularly in the case of large sites where phasing may be synched with infrastructure delivery over a long time, and are more susceptible to changing market conditions, including availability of building materials/technologies/skilled labour.

The interaction between Paragraphs E and D must also be clarified; i.e. the effect of necessary infrastructure on setting ambitious build-out rates, particularly given often uncoordinated (sometimes due to legal constraints) short term planning and funding for infrastructure, and an insecure/insufficient infrastructure funding environment overall. Furthermore, this policy 's accompanying text should address what 'planning for all necessary supporting infrastructure from the outset' means and who defines what is 'all necessary'. Infrastructure needs are often emergent, and the process iterative rather than linear. It is also not just a question of how much more housing infrastructure can enable, but how much more infrastructure more housing requires, given already significant cumulative deficits.

As already stated under policy GG2, LBN also question the lack of reference to strategic Green Belt review.

### **Policy GG5: Growing a good economy**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, Paragraph C needs to go beyond securing sufficient space for employment and industrial land, by better recognising the importance of managing transitions, neighbourliness, logistics brought about by a greater mixing of uses across areas etc. Additionally, what is 'the right location', and who defines this? Given a stressed market, where residential 'hope values' continue to displace existing and potential employment floorspace, remaining

employment locations are not always going to be optimal. Furthermore, strong clusters of the new economy have not always evolved in predictable locations (e.g. Old Street high tech cluster evolved organically); policy needs to remain flexible and to protect viable clusters.

The meaning of 'sufficiency' under Paragraph D should also be clarified. Infrastructure needs are often emergent, and the process iterative rather than linear. It is also not just a question of infrastructure necessary to accommodate new development, but also addressing already significant cumulative deficits.

Moreover, Paragraph G doesn't make particular sense. What does 'maximising' the transport network and town centre network mean? Is there a word missing e.g. the potential of?

### **Policy GG6: Increasing efficiency and resilience**

LBN are supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

## **Chapter 2: Spatial Development Patterns**

### **Policy SD1: Opportunity Areas**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, LBN object to B.4 as it unnecessarily fetters local capacity to meet over-arching strategic objectives of directing the densest of development to the most suitable locations, taking into consideration a variety of local character matters, including place hierarchy. 'Recognising that larger area can define their own character and density' does not mean there shouldn't be a strategy behind it (see Historic England's Tall Buildings Advice Note 4 which supersedes CABE's 'Guidance on Tall Buildings').

B.7 is also problematic in the absence of committed long-term infrastructure spending. Without clear guidance and funding mechanisms to support this policy point, it will result in additional resource strains on boroughs.

LBN support the statement under paragraph 2.1.4 regarding OAPFs not being the only valid planning framework for OAs, but more needs to be said on avoiding overlap, and the need for coordination, transparency and consistency between and within public sector agencies, infrastructure providers and developers/landowners.

In addition we have the following area-specific comments:

The Thames Estuary Production Corridor section needs to also recognise its strategic role for wharf operations and logistics. It is inappropriate to only

focus on cultural and creative uses in an area with significant other 'production' capacity (e.g. food stuffs and chemicals), including long-standing businesses that remain dedicated to the area. A more ambitious expansion of LR network is also required to support expected growth in the area; currently missing link from Royal Docks/Beckon Riverside across river Roding to Barking that would optimise development potential in the growth triangle of Stratford – Royal Docks & Beckton – Barking Riverside. Links via Stratford are insufficient to fully support good growth in this area. Furthermore, river crossings are underspecified (subsumed into general 'Public Transport growth').

The 'Poplar Riverside' OA name fails to capture the geography of the area, particularly the Lea River Park setting. Moreover, the section makes no reference to the Lea River Park whatsoever, in spite of its significance for sub-regional housing capacity in affording new public transport, walking and cycling accessibility, as well as strategic open space: this is also inconsistent with policies GG3.E and GG2.D. Reference to the Poplar Riverside Housing Zone should be removed to reflect current Mayoral position on this. The spatial extent also needs to be clarified, as it currently overlaps with the Royal Docks and Beckton OA.

Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside OA references to employment land vacancies continue to be problematic as it is not supported by the evidence base, and are inconsistent with policy GG5. The Newham Employment Land Review, co-funded by the GLA, has indicated that there is continued strong demand for employment floorspace in the Royal Docks, and that industrial development is viable once residential 'hope value' is ignored – but this is affecting land availability. Additionally, reference to Beckton Riverside development being 'residential-led' should be removed, as the area is allocated for mixed use in the newly revised Local Plan, being as it contains important strategic infrastructure and SIL capacity of much broader significance.. Such a site specific reference is in any case arguably inappropriate in a strategic document.

The Elizabeth Line East Corridor likewise should acknowledge key infrastructure interventions needed, for e. g. Stratford station capacity enhancements. Additionally, this section is silent on Olympic Legacy and Ilford OAs, in spite of their strategic importance to growth in East London.

Lastly, in Figures 2.4-12, colours used for 'Nascent' and 'Ready to Grow' are hard to tell apart when overlaid with other details on the maps. Similarly, 'Maturing' and 'Mature'.

### **Policy SD2 Collaboration in the Wider South East**

On the whole LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, as per our comments on Good Growth policies, the remit needs to include a Strategic Green Belt Review .

### **Policy SD3 Growth Locations in the Wider South East and Beyond**

LBN supports this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy SD4 The CAZ/Policy SD4 Development in the CAZ**

Whilst welcoming the acknowledgement of Stratford's emergent role as CAZ [future potential] reserve, it is unclear what the associated policy expectations are of this location.

### **Policy SD5: Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ**

No comment.

### **Policy SD6 Town centres**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

The increased focus on night time, cultural and visitor economies beyond traditional Central London locations and the recognition of the important role social infrastructure can play in sustaining town centre vitality are particularly welcomed.

However, points A.2 and C. and the related paragraph 2.6.2 should be amended to clarify that high density housing will not be appropriate in all town centres/all edge of centre locations. A design-led, blanket approach is not supported. Intensification is not merely a matter of public transport/services accessibility and the ability of local setting to absorb townscape changes. It should also be plan-led, following a strategy for good growth that reflects place vision, hierarchy and function. As the NPPF makes clear that new development should be plan-led, the current policy approach unnecessarily restricts local capacity to meet over-arching strategic objectives of strategically directing high density and tall buildings.

LBN also object to point D. The London Plan should not apply a blanket approach by expecting developments in town centres to cater distinctly to smaller households, Build to Rent, older people's housing and student accommodation. This is inconsistent with Policy GG4.C requiring creation of mixed and inclusive communities, by appearing to discriminate against provision of families in town centres for which a two-bed home would be insufficient. The London housing market is not homogenous and therefore housing mix is not a matter of strategic importance. As per the NPPF para 50, policies on housing mix should be plan-led and respond to local current and future needs identified through the evidence base. LBN's approach to housing mix responds to a broader spatial strategy for good growth and housing needs identified through the sub-regional SHMA 2016. Any provision needs to be

balanced on a case by case basis against need to provide family housing and conventional housing more broadly, alongside specialist offer, in accordance with the Local Plan. The new London Plan is too prescriptive and policy unnecessarily restricts local capacity to meet locally identified housing need.

### **Policy SD7 Town centre network**

LBN are supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, Para A.4 should provide more flexibility by recognising other forms of intensification of retail parks may be appropriate in some cases where supported through Local Plans, (e.g. to help alleviate pressure on employment land) recognising for instance, that not all are in sustainable locations for residential development absent significant transformations in public transport accessibility.

### **Policy SD9 Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation**

LBN generally support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, it is considered that there is a particular focus on specialist forms of housing such as build to rent, student housing and housing for older people. Town centres tend to offer a broad range of housing typologies which serve the needs of all people including families. Policy SD9 should not place emphasis on specialist forms of housing and should follow the inclusive tone set elsewhere in the London Plan and strive to support mixed and balanced communities.

## **Chapter 3: Design**

### **Policy D1 London's form and characteristics**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy D2 Delivering good design**

This is a detailed and comprehensive policy which sets out how high quality design will be delivered from the beginning to end of a development. The strategic emphasis on maintenance of design quality and use of architect retention clauses

(paragraph H.4) are welcomed and address significant concerns in Newham over subsequent employment of 'delivery' architects.

The draft policy (paragraph A) introduces a requirement for boroughs (not developers) to undertake an 'evaluation' in preparing development plans and area-based strategies which is to cover a comprehensive range of planning, socio-economic, transport and topographical considerations and which will be the basis for assessment of sustainable options for growth and appropriate form of development. Whilst this is supported, it would be useful to separate this specific task out from the wider policy and better link it to housing and good growth policies. In undertaking the evaluations outlined in policy, there is a suggestion that boroughs should themselves establish sustainable options for good growth which would extend to housing – including in relation to mix (as housing type and tenure are an initial evaluation consideration). Whilst this would be welcomed, this stands in contrast to the draft London Plan's set housing targets and position on size mix (our objections to which are outlined in LBN's response to H1, H2 and H12).

### **Policy D3 Inclusive design**

The LBN generally support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. It is useful to push concepts such as parity of user dignity, non-separation of entrances etc at the Pan-London level.

Policy D3, Part A(3) relates to emergency evacuations from buildings. Discussions with LBN's Building Control section found that there are a number of factors which determine when a fire evacuation lift is used and what the fire strategy should be. If a general lift is used in a core it is not normally regarded as an evacuation lift, this is due to other life safety features being required so the lift can become an evacuation lift. This policy therefore needs to be amended so that it is in accordance with building regulations.

### **Policy D4 Housing quality and standards**

The incorporation of [more of] the design standards from the Mayor's Housing SPG into London Plan policy is supported by the LBN and on the whole it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

It is noted however that the Housing SPD advises a minimum width of 2.75 metres for all double and single rooms. The new policy stance is in line with the Technical Housing Standards which requires that at least one double or twin bedroom should have a minimum width of 2.75 metres. The policy should be worded to seek that all bedrooms to adhere to a minimum width of 2.75 metres as set out in the SPG.

### **Policy D5: Accessible Housing**

LBN welcome the continuation of existing policy into the draft London Plan under policy D5, however it is noted that the requirements of M4(3) can still bring costs to the local authority to support the adaptations required to make a home 'adapted', so in terms of real additions to stock, the 10% is the more significant.

In addition, the interaction of paragraph 3.5.3 and Policy D11 is unclear and requires further explanation. As written it would seem to imply that 2 lifts are needed to account for lift failure, which could be a significant extra cost.

In relation to the lift exceptions clause, (paragraph 3.5.6 - and it is unclear why this is not in the policy itself rather than the supporting text) it is sensible to acknowledge that certain developments will not be able to ensure step-free access through lift provision, however the inclusion of a lift(s) will inevitably have implications for ongoing maintenance that will impact on the affordability of service charges. LBN are therefore cautious about the last point of the exceptions policy without further detail provided on the threshold at which such service charges are considered to be unaffordable – otherwise it could be used to universally avoid lift provision in blocks of 4 storeys or less.

### **Policy D6 Optimising housing density**

Use of maximum density guidance in current London Plan has not been a primary consideration in determination of Major applications in Newham. Density has mainly been assessed on the criteria outlined in this new policy: a design-led approach based on an evaluation of the site's attributes, public transport accessibility, its surrounding context and capacity for growth and the most appropriate development form (paragraphs A and B).

We therefore do not object to loss of Table 3.2 Sustainable residential quality (SRQ) density matrix in the current London Plan. However, a case by case approach will inevitably result in inconsistencies within the borough let alone across London. Although use of maximums may not be appropriate some quantitative guidance on high density development would assist planning decision-making. There also needs to be clarification going forward about how consistent pan-London capacity testing (through the SHLAA) will be undertaken without such a matrix.

Where high density major schemes are proposed above set density thresholds the policy sets out there will be greater scrutiny of design, housing standards (policy D4) and ongoing management plans (paragraph C). This approach throws up some troubling questions. Will other development be subject to a lesser degree of scrutiny? What will greater scrutiny exactly entail?

The policy also requires that proposals must also submit density figures in several formats: habitable rooms, bedrooms and bedspaces per hectare; and major applications must include floor area ratio, site coverage ratio, and building heights above ground level and Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). This aspect of the policy will be of assistance in identifying appropriate density at a specific location.

However, there are concerns that cumulative impacts or area based capacity issues might not be adequately considered by being plot based rather than area based, with recognition that there are limits to what 'design-led' optimisation can achieve. Local Plans should be expected to define this on the basis of capacity as per policy D2 above.

### **Policy D7 Public realm**

LBN are generally supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. Emphasis on meanwhile uses in public realm at phased

developments is an interesting innovation (paragraph K) as is greater recognition of the 24 hour nature of such spaces.

It is however suggested that the D7 Part A is amended to require the incorporation of “appropriate quality design” rather than the “highest quality design” or at least wording that reflects the need for the public realm to be serviceable and can be adequately maintained, without abnormal costs, particularly where the maintenance of that area is the responsibility of a local authority. Generally also, while high quality design including durability is important, in a scheme, it may also be more appropriate to direct the extra expenditure related to the ‘highest’ quality street furniture etc to other aspects of street furniture.

The emerging ‘Public London Charter’ is supported in principle, notably the drive to ensure that the public realm offers the highest level of public access. However, this must be balanced against issues around safety, effective management and maintenance of such spaces. The council would welcome greater detail on the rules and restrictions on public access as set out in the charter, and seek further engagement and consultation with the Mayor on its design.

### **Policy D8 Tall buildings**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham’s Draft Revised Local Plan: we particularly concur that Local Plans should be the place where appropriate and inappropriate areas for tall buildings, and of their indicative heights.

It would however be useful for the supporting text (or the policy itself) to specify key design parameters for tall buildings such as optimum units per core, internal management requirements, amenity space access arrangements and quantum.

### **Policy D9 Basement development**

LBN agree this is potentially a useful policy, though basement development is not presently a common form of development in Newham

### **Policy D10 Safety, security and resilience to emergency**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham’s Draft Revised Local Plan

### **Policy D11 Fire safety**

This policy is supported by LBN. It is noted that this policy echoes building regulation requirements and therefore, local authorities will need to set up a system to ensure that these points are addressed by both planning and building control.

### **Policy D12 Agent of Change**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham’s Draft Revised Local Plan. It is noted that noise generating uses

must still be operating lawfully and within the bounds of 'reasonableness' as per environmental legislation. LBN welcome the Agent of Change referencing both cultural uses and industrial uses to support ongoing viable operations and manage the relationship between differing land uses.

Further details would be helpful as to its implementation however, particularly around where AoC would apply in relation to proximity of existing uses and how the AoC principle would site when change of businesses may occur at a property with different operations falling within the same use class e.g. uses within B2 Use Class may operate at different hours of the day. Additionally, further implementation guidance is required on how to address the status quo, where there is no legal basis for assessing whether the level of noise generated by existing uses is reasonable; for example businesses may not be undertaking all reasonable steps to minimise their operational noise effects, including through management, maintenance and operational hours, where they have had no historic basis to do so. In effect, this would mean that unreasonable noise levels will add additional mitigation measures and thus unnecessary viability strain and poorer quality of environment for new residential development. It is also unclear to what extent the Agent of Change could be used to protect planned-for land uses rather than actual developments.

### **Policy D13 Noise**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

## **Chapter 4 Housing**

### **Policy H1 Increasing Housing Supply**

LBN acknowledges the need to increase housing supply to address London's housing crisis, and are broadly in agreement with the policy's aspiration to optimise development through delivery focussed Development Plans (including site allocations, windfall sites, Opportunity Areas, high PTAL areas etc.): we are a pro-development borough. However overall the content of draft policy H1 is strongly objected to. It is considered that in its current form, the policy poses significant risk to the ability of boroughs to deliver sustainable development through a plan-led process.

Under this policy LBN sees its housing target almost double, from 19,945 in the current plan to 38,500 between 2019 and 2029. Unlike previous SHLAAs that acknowledged that London's need will outstrip supply and relied on capacity derived targets, the methodology behind the final target includes a cumulative total from small sites based upon GLA modelling (in addition to the usual potential delivery from identified large sites of 0.25ha and above and permissions for non-self contained units). Whilst the capacity derived figure on large sites of 28,850 is agreed as reasonable and achievable, the addition of a small sites figure of 9500 units over the ten year period that adds significantly to the total is not an appropriate approach in a Newham context, nor is there evidence to attest to its achievability during the plan period. This

is discussed further in our response to policy H2.

Relying on a target that is no longer capacity derived is practically concerning. It is far in excess (approx. 33%) of the capacities identified on large sites (including those proposed for industrial release) which were arrived at through collaborative work between LBN and the GLA over several months. Even in more recent years with the market at its peak (and including delivery in the LLDC area that has seen numerous large scale high density developments come forward) delivery in LBN has not reached 3000 units. Post recession, delivery figures fell to below 450 units and remained low for a number of years. Developers are already raising issues about market capacity and differentiation with multiple sites coming forward at once for similar types of development (in the Stratford area for instance) and there are also issues with regards the number of firms available to deliver development at scale, and availability of appropriate plant and materials.

Sidestepping this issue by substituting an annual target with a ten year target, does little to solve the problem, only resulting in some years expected to deliver astronomical numbers to make up for any previous shortfalls. LBN's housing trajectory demonstrates under this target an annual shortfall of around 550 units a year, which given the existing policy position on conversions of existing units would have to be met on large sites. On the basis of recent delivery patterns this would require each large site delivery in the borough to absorb in excess of a 110 units, or approximately 20 storeys. Considering height restrictions already enforced by airport safeguarding, together with the fact that new buildings in Newham are already extremely dense and tall, this seems unlikely to meet the definition of 'good growth'.

Finally, it is a concern to LBN that no sensitivity testing has been included in the GLA's evidence base to account for market fluctuations and shortfalls in pan-London delivery.

Overall, the LBN target currently included within draft policy H1 is untested and unrealistic. For this reason, LBN have including an alternative, yet still ambitious target within the Submission Draft Local Plan (2018) of 43,000 units over the 15 year plan period, recognising actual delivery trends and constraints, as well as the development pipeline. When rolled forward, this figure presents a robust, justified, ambitious, yet achievable target that is a significant uplift on the existing London Plan, by approximately 20%. In setting unreasonable targets the GLA are risking the broad strategic principles of the London and local plans, through an unachievable target that will render local and regional policies extremely vulnerable, for example, protection of SIL. It seems perverse, in attempting to achieve strategic planning at a London level, that draft policy is introduced that poses such a risk, especially penalising boroughs such as LBN, who already deliver significant numbers and in comparison to others, and will continue to deliver in future (see page 69 of the SHLAA, 2017).

### **Policy H2 Small Sites**

Whilst LBN does not dispute the ability of small sites to play a role in housing delivery and in principle supports the encouragement of well-designed homes

on windfall sites, the draft policy in its current form is strongly objected to. It is considered that H2 significantly oversteps the London Plan's strategic role and in doing so risks LBN's ability to deliver sustainable development that meets the evidenced local need through a plan-led process.

Firstly, in relation to H2.B1, LBN's Local Plan already maximises opportunities for development in a plan-led way, recognising the potential for opportunities to evolve with the plan, ensuring that transitional change occurs in the right locations to deliver (quality) housing, jobs and other infrastructure that meets need. This is the mark of robust plan-making. It does not, and should not, follow that character changes are led through the London Plan to accommodate increased densities purely to meet small sites targets.

Secondly, LBN have significant concerns in terms of the 'presumption in favour of small sites', introduced alongside a small sites housing target. These include: flaws in the methodology behind the target; the borough's ability to deliver numbers on small sites at this volume; the principle of this policy approach in an LBN context; the inability to plan adequately for infrastructure; and a lack of regard for quality as a policy consideration.

Focusing first on the small sites methodology, as acknowledged by the SHLAA 2017, the NPPF and PPG states that windfall assumptions for projected delivery rates on unidentified sites can be included in assessments of potential housing supply provided that there is compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the area and will continue to provide a reliable source. The allowance should be realistic and have regard to historic windfall deliver rates and expected future trends.

Rather than rely on past trends, arguably the only realistic indication of future projections - which suggests a small site delivery of around 2500 for LBN between 2019 and 2029 - the GLA's modelled approach instead produces a 9500 small sites figure. This is arrived at through a new set of standard multipliers applied to existing housing across London (terrace, detached and semi-detached homes) with a PTAL of 3 and above or within 800m of a tube station. The SHLAA notes that whilst annual net completions from small sites overall has returned to post-recession trends, housing conversions still lag behind. The assumption made is that this *may* be down to local policies restricting such permissions, acting as presumptions against small site delivery, thus reversing this at regional level will drastically speed up the conversion rate. Not only is no evidence provided as to how this policy will significantly increase delivery given that most pro-development boroughs already take every opportunity to increase supply, there appears no evidence to attest to the fact that local policy is the full picture in terms of slowed conversion rates generally. Moreover, the method fails to acknowledge the fact that housing conversions are finite, and may have significantly slowed through lack of scope to convert more. Whilst in theory the methodology excludes units that have already been lost through conversion or subdivision, (using the LDD records) given more homes may be converted than are currently recorded by planning records, the cumulative impacts of conversions may already be evidenced, especially in Newham with its history of unlawful

conversions. It is likely therefore that significantly fewer units will have been netted off than reflects reality.

Setting aside whether it is locally acceptable to promote conversions, or whether there is even scope to do so given likely 'unknown' losses, there is no evidence to suggest that LBN could deliver 950 units per year. Whilst it could be argued that small sites are much less vulnerable to recession and other delivery issues than large sites, Newham (excl. the LLDC area) on average over the past 6 years has delivered 231 units on small sites below 0.25ha, with annual figures that have never gone above 352 units at the peak of market activity. Given that we already explore opportunities for infill and extensions, it is unclear how an additional 6-700 units could be achieved. Moreover, it is also a broad leap to assume that a fixed number of units can be delivered from any existing terraced homes, given the variation in the size of terraces. This ignores whether or not scope exists to create new units that meet space standards and are quality homes. It is of particular concern to LBN therefore that the target isn't adjusted to account for size variations (in terraced houses) and that the presumption itself fails to mention 'quality' as a factor in decision making. This is particularly concerning given the persistent effort that has been required through planning policy, enforcement and private sector licensing to significantly reduce the prevalence of poor, sub-standard flat conversions and other forms of subdivision.

Notwithstanding the above, reliance on conversions as a significant source of supply remains problematic in an LBN context because it involves loss of family-sized houses. Newham's evidence base (ONEL SHMA 2016) is clear that the highest housing need (regardless of tenure) is for 3 bed family homes. In securing sustainable development, local policy continues to support a 39% family housing target in new development, (subject to viability) as well as resisting conversions of existing stock, apart from in carefully defined unique circumstances. The presumption in favour of small sites is therefore inherently problematic in a Newham context where significant proportions of 3 bed homes were lost to conversion or to HMOs prior to the implementation of the Core Strategy, placing significant pressure on the remaining stock. Given the slow rate of delivery of new 3 bed stock, (given viability limitations) it is essential that Newham continues to retain its family housing stock and works towards eradicating the historical issues of substandard and poor quality housing that still blights areas of the borough.

Some of the points that LBN raise in relation to the small sites target, could perhaps have been addressed through sensitivity testing, first, of potential impacts of market trends and second (in tandem with the boroughs as the experts in their local areas) whether suggested conversion rates could actually be met within the existing stock. None however has been undertaken by the GLA.

The reliance on such sites for extensive delivery is also problematic in terms of infrastructure planning, as incremental change is more difficult to measure and will yield much lower CIL rates than the development of large scale sites. In this regard small sites are unlikely to significantly contribute to the boroughs

identified CIL Infrastructure Planning and Funding Gap which remains in excess of 110 million. Adding further pressure to already strained infrastructure is unsustainable, and does not align well with broader spatial strategies and the good growth agenda. It is unclear whether the cumulative environmental impact of such incremental change has been adequately captured in IIA.

Finally, LBN object to both the requirement of Design Codes in order to deflect the presumption in favour of small sites, considering this to be redundant if an authority has an up to date local plan which appropriately plans for small sites provision, and point H regarding affordable housing given the threshold of 11 units, which fails to align with LBN's approach. The latter point is discussed further in the response to H6.

To conclude, an unachievable target that is not a capacity derived renders local and regional policies extremely vulnerable. It seems perverse, in attempting to achieve strategic planning at a London level, that draft policy is introduced that poses such a risk, in favour of a quick fix to compensate for a much reduced capacity from industrial land release, and a political commitment not to release green belt. H2 in its current form perpetuates environmental injustice, privileging those all ready well off, at the expense of those that have already suffered poor housing, which is finally improving due to sustained efforts by LBN. H3 Monitoring housing targets

### **Policy H3: Monitoring Housing Targets**

Whilst LBN supports in principle the need for monitoring as a test of any plan's effectiveness, for the reasons outline above with regards to the overall housing and small sites targets for the borough, points A and B of draft policy H3 are objected to. The policy in its current form removes flexibility and local discretion.

### **Policy H4 Meanwhile use**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan which seeks temporary accommodation as a meanwhile use on strategic sites.

### **Policy H5 Delivering Affordable Housing**

LBN are supportive of the overarching strategic aspiration 50% affordable target which accords with Newham's adopted and emerging Local Plan, welcoming the Mayor's use of grant to boost affordable housing supply and the commitment to ensure Mayoral agreements with affordable housing providers and strategic partners in terms of delivery. It would however be useful for the plan to set out the Mayor's approach in achieving such agreements. LBN are also supportive of the emphasis on on-site affordable housing provision, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, and consider that this broadly aligns with the LBN's approach, whereby off-site provision is only considerable if on-site is undeliverable or would result in less affordable housing delivered.

LBN however object to the application of a blanket approach to affordable housing set out by the threshold approach, which does not accord with LBN's policy position. The reasoning behind this objection is set out in more detail within our response to Draft Policy H6.

### **Policy H6 Threshold Approach to applications**

LBN object to the threshold approach to affordable housing set out within draft policy H6. In introducing a sweeping approach at regional level, the Mayor may inadvertently impede individual boroughs' ability to gain more from development proposals in terms of an affordable offer. Indeed, impacts are already being felt with the Council's officers spending disproportionate time during Development Management negotiations justifying an already adopted position which yields considerable levels of affordable housing.

LBN's current approach – a 50% strategic target delivered through a 35% to 50% range target - accounts for variations in land values in different parts of the borough, and acknowledges the potential for large scale regeneration to impact upon growth and have considerable effects on levels of affordable housing available in schemes. Given that recent high level viability testing (undertaken as part of Local Plan review) is clear that some sites in Newham can achieve the maximum level now, whilst others are more likely to in the future when factoring in growth, it is necessary to ensure that detailed viability testing takes place between the 35% and 49% range on all sites (not just those subject to SIL release or under public ownership), to allow for full interrogation of schemes. With this approach, LBN currently delivers affordable housing at a healthy consistent rate (in excess of many other London boroughs) and it is essential, given updated viability work, that this position be upheld. Whilst it is understood that the GLA is attempting embed affordable housing requirements into land values, 35% instead acts as a cap and flexibility should be applied to that threshold where boroughs have supporting evidence. It is considered possible to embed affordable housing requirements into land values at more localised levels, provided that support is given to local authorities' approaches at the regional level. Moreover, whilst the Mayor's commitment to the use of grant to boost affordable housing is welcomed, it is unclear as to why giving the variations show in the GLA's viability report, that 35% is the only threshold that is to be applied, regardless of the proposal or context.

In addition, LBN object to the assessment of affordable housing on a habitable room basis, and the application of the policy only on schemes of 11 units or more and consider that flexibility at a local level should apply. Although the London Plan approach follows the controversial Ministerial Statement and NPPG amendment, and some decisions made in court regarding the threshold for affordable housing, given the acknowledgement from a legal viewpoint that these do not render existing adopted policy null and void, it is LBN's intention to maintain the adopted policy, applying affordable housing requirements to schemes of 10 units plus.

In relation to units vs. habitable rooms, where as in Newham, a significant proportion of all new homes are sought as 3 bedroom (39% in Newham) – delivering more rooms per unit within any given scheme - seeking housing on a habitable room basis could result in less affordable provision comparably. For example, in a scheme of 10 units delivering a policy compliant level of family homes, the total habitable rooms is 31. In a borough without the family housing requirement, habitable rooms are likely to be higher. Assuming a 50% affordable provision, 5 units would be required to reach the maximum affordable threshold. If however 50% affordable provision were sought on a habitable rooms basis, only 16 rooms would be required to be affordable. Assuming that larger 3 bed units are the affordable offer, this equates to 4 affordable units, less than could have been achieved if seeking affordable provision on a unit basis. When considering the significant cumulative impact that this would have on affordable housing delivery within the borough, a unit basis remains the most appropriate approach in Newham.

The reliance on viability review mechanisms and EUV+ benchmark land values are supported.

#### **Policy H7 Affordable Housing Tenure**

LBN are general supportive of draft policy H7 and consider that it is broadly aligned with the LBN's approach to tenure requirements. However, given the above concerns about the low level (35%) threshold for detailed viability appraisal (set out in the response to H6) there should be flexibility about how part B is applied locally (e.g. it should only be applied in a Newham context where schemes meet the 50% affordable housing target and demonstrate the appropriate tenure split).

#### **Policy H8 Monitoring Affordable Housing**

LBN are supportive of this policy in principle.

#### **Policy H9 Vacant Building Credit**

LBN are supportive of this policy in principle and welcome clarification from the GLA in this regard.

#### **Policy H10 Redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration**

Notwithstanding the above objections to the threshold approach to viability testing of affordable housing set out in our response to H6, LBN are generally supportive of this policy in principle.

#### **Policy H11 Ensuring the best use of housing stock**

Although LBN are broadly in support of the draft H11, much of the policy is outside of its role as a local planning authority. In relation to Mayoral support over 'buy to leave' it is noted that neither the policy nor accompanying text provides detail on how this would be demonstrated.

## **Policy H12 Housing size mix**

LBN object to this policy and consider that in its current form it poses significant risk to the ability of boroughs to deliver sustainable development that meets the needs of its population, through a plan-led process. LBN also have significant concerns relating to the evidence base that underpins the policy.

In determining appropriate mix in relation to local context, LBN do have regard to many of the points set out within the draft policy – the requirement to deliver mixed and balanced communities; need to deliver range of units/tenures; optimising housing potential; and resisting proposals of mainly 1 and 2 bed units. However, recent Local Plan evidence base (ONEL SHMA, 2016) is clear that the greatest need in LBN lies in 3 bed family housing (in both market and affordable sectors), thus relying on locally distinct evidence, it is essential to retain LBN's existing 39% family housing target. In this regard, LBN object to part C regarding prescriptive mix, however note that our own 39% requirement is applied flexibly through being subject to viability, availability of subsidy, existing mix of housing in the area and the individual context and circumstance of the site.

LBN produced their own SHMA, following the Examination in Public on the Further Alterations to the London Plan. Although the Inspector commented that individual boroughs did not need to produce their own SHMAs given the evidence base at pan-London level, the GLA continued to encourage boroughs to produce their own evidence base of this type, to ensure that local and sub-regional HMAs were adequately investigated, drilling down to more detailed information than the pan-London SHMA could offer. This advice is currently distilled in the Mayor's Housing SPG, though this is now contradicted by the GLA's new 2017 SHMA, which supports the draft London Plan.

The 2017 GLA SHMA, suggests that family housing is in lesser need than smaller units at a pan-London level. The overarching assumption is that a faster rate of population growth is expected amongst older persons and that this is enough to significantly accelerate the number of households needed through their likelihood to create demand for smaller units. LBN are unconvinced by such assertions. Firstly, whilst the SHMA demonstrates an increase in single persons above 65 as a proportion of the total, this increase is not hugely significant (see pg. 45). Neither is that of the growth in families with no dependent children, and in any case, affordability is currently producing the trend that adult children return to live in the family home even if they are not wholly dependent on their parents given independent earning capacity. Although there is a more significant change in families with dependent children (again as a proportion of the total) there is also a significant drop in single persons (15-64) and an increase in 'other' (i.e. those more likely to be housed in shared accommodation). Together these variants ultimately would seem to produce a neutral impact. This leaves unanswered questions in terms of how average household size will fall from well above, to well below, the national average (2.4 persons per household and stable for the last decade) especially with a fairly insignificant growth in older persons that is relied upon to justify the draft London Plan's policy interventions. What the GLA SHMA seems to demonstrate instead – through such a growth in

'other' - is that whilst 'x' number of bedrooms are needed, the mix of how these should be achieved cannot automatically be determined. In this regard, it fails to justify draft London Plan policy pertaining to mix and represents no evidence to support conversions and small site increases without regard for the impact on family housing, or to abandon LBN's existing evidence base and others which justify local positions on housing mix.

Moreover, it appears that the level of 3 bedroom need is significantly reduced (halved) only when affordability is taken into account. If it is the case that need reduces through being unable to afford the right type of home, there is even less justification in increasing demand (inflating prices) through building less of this type. Notwithstanding that LBN do not accept the assertions made in the 2017 SHMA, in a borough such as Newham which demonstrates a young population, together with ethnic groups that are significantly more likely to live in large family units regardless of age (i.e. multi-generational households) there is remains no justification to relax family housing policy at a local level. Whilst LBN do not deny that some families will live in two bed units, this is not necessarily by preference, and would not be suitable for the vast majority of need within the borough.

This SHMA (2017) therefore cannot be considered to be robust alternative evidence document, justifying the removal of LBN's adopted family housing target – a figure already far lower than the ONEL SHMA's OAN 3 bed need (64%). There exists no evidence that our target is placing undue constraints on development, a position further supported by recent viability work on the proposed and existing site allocations (see Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment 2017).

Overall, introducing policy that uses a broad brush approach to London's housing size mix and that effectively suggests that there is only a need to manage affordable housing mix will fail to meet need, and sets a worrying precedent for the squeezing out of families from inner London boroughs. In this regard, the draft policy oversteps its strategic role.

### **Policy H13 Build to rent**

Whilst LBN are in support of the policy in terms of the promotion of Build to Rent (BtR), welcoming this product (in accordance with the criteria set out in part B) as part of a broader housing mix within the emerging Local Plan, the approach to affordable housing set out in Part A, C, and D is objected to. LBN's objections to the Threshold Approach have been made clear in the response the draft policy H6. LBN are also of the opinion that affordable housing policy in relation to build to rent should allow for flexibility at local level in terms of mix, type etc. where boroughs have supporting evidence or divergent housing needs. It is unclear as to why, in welcoming BtR, that this product should be required to contribute to only one type of affordable product, regardless of local need.

### **Policy H14 Supported and specialised accommodation**

LBN are supportive of this policy in principle and consider that it currently aligns with specialist housing policy of the Local Plan and ongoing work as part of the its Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

### **Policy H15 Specialist older persons housing**

LBN are supportive of this policy in principle and consider that it broadly aligns with policy of the Local Plan.

### **Policy H16 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation**

Whilst LBN are committed to supporting Gypsy and Traveller communities, draft policy H16 is objected to as it fails to conform with the national policy position, under which local planning policy pertaining to Gypsy and Travellers has recently been prepared.

Planning policy at national level, Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (2015), is clear that in planning terms Gypsies and Travellers are persons of a nomadic habit of life (i.e. those that travel for the purposes of work). Prepared in accordance with the PPTS, using a methodology accepted by various Inspectors in terms of establishing planning need under the new definition, as well as how the needs of those who do not should be interpreted, Newham's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2016 is a robust credible demonstration of the planning need in LBN for Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showperson's accommodation. The document which demonstrates no planning need within the borough, informed LBN's now adopted Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation DPD (2017) that does not contain any site allocations.

Whilst households that do not travel fall outside of the planning definition of a Traveller, LBN are mindful that this does not negate any responsibility to such persons. However, it is the responsibility of the Council in its role as a Local *Housing* Authority - under the Housing Act (1985) and Housing and Planning Act (2016) - to assess and consider how to meet the need for non-travelling Gypsies and Travellers, as part of its wider responsibilities to plan for the accommodation needs of the settled community and in light of the Equalities Act (2010). The housing needs of all Gypsy and Traveller households have in fact been assessed by Authority's SHMA (2016), albeit in aggregate, whether they travel or not. As such, in planning terms LBN will meet their need as part of planning to meet the overall OAN. Furthermore, provisions set out in the Housing and Planning Act (2016) includes a duty for local authorities to consider the needs of people residing in or resorting to their district with respect to the provision of sites on which caravans can be stationed.

Policy H16 therefore would be unjustifiably costly for LBN in terms of renewing evidence base given the timeframes specified, or would result in a reliance on out of date GLA evidence. It is submitted that the GLA should instead undertake this work at the regional level with the input of boroughs, and support sub-regional cooperation and co-ordination to ensure that needs are met.

### **Policy H17 Purpose-built student accommodation**

LBN are broadly supportive of the draft policy and consider that it does not contravene the current local policy position which seeks to deliver student accommodation, where need can be demonstrated. The strengthening of policy in terms securing affordable housing is welcomed, however if this is to

be benchmarked at a 35% minimum, further detail should be added into policy allowing for flexibility at a local level.

### **Policy H18 Large-scale purpose-built shared living**

LBN are supportive of purpose build shared living complexes, provided that these are delivered as part of a wider mix, in the right location and in response to need. In this regard draft policy H18 broadly aligns with LBN's existing and emerging policy. However, as LBN's stance remains that affordability within housing is not to be achieved at the expense of quality or through size minimisation, there is significant concern that these units are often far below minimum space standards, therefore do not represent a quality housing offer. In addition, whilst requiring affordable housing from this type of use is supported, the 35% threshold requirement is not (as per LBN's response to H6). LBN are also of the opinion that the type and level of contribution expected should be determined by the local authority, in accordance with viability, not set at the regional level.

### **Conclusion**

As a pro-development authority, determined to increase housing supply to address the housing crisis, the London Borough of Newham's (LBN) Submission Draft Local Plan continues to promote an ambitious strategy for housing delivery, whereby a broad supply of quality homes of varying types, tenures and sizes will ensure choice within the market and will meet both local and strategic housing need. Whilst there are considerable improvements to London Plan policies in relation to housing and support for many elements of the Plan, the shortcomings identified against each policy pose considerable risk to the achievement of sustainable development and existing policies of Local Plans.

## **Chapter 5: Social Infrastructure**

### **Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, parts F and G of the policy are conflicting. It is unclear if policy S1(F) is entirely separate from S1(G) or if they should they be read as complementary. For example, if point 1 or 2 of S1(F) was met would an applicant be expected to meet S1(G) as well? Or if S1(F) is met does S1(G) become irrelevant? This confusion could be avoided through combining the 2 parts (F & G) into one cohesive point. This would allow for the release of social infrastructure facilities where appropriate to be managed to best effect while ensuring that the needs of other providers are taken into consideration.

In paragraph 5.1.3, there needs to be an acknowledgement that social infrastructure planning is an iterative process that needs to account for the designed capacity of sites, which often exceeds that anticipated in capacity/needs assessments ahead of more detailed work.

### **Policy S2 Health and social care facilities**

LBN are supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy S3 Education and childcare facilities**

LBN are generally supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, paragraph 5.3.5 needs to include commentary that acknowledges the lack of optimal sites for schools. The policy also needs to ensure that it does not become a poor substitute for the proper tackling of air pollution and the creation of good walkable access. In relation to secondary school provision, issues related to the appropriate distribution of schools that takes into consideration potential adverse impacts on existing patterns of application (e.g. gender balance/viable levels of pupils) and staff recruitment should be discussed, alongside the London Schools Atlas, in paragraph 5.3.7. The issue of loss of facilities should link back to points F and G in Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure to ensure any release of education facilities is managed effectively.

### **Policy S4 Play and informal recreation**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, commentary should be included which clarifies where the child yield calculator will be located (i.e. will the calculator remain in the Play and Informal Recreation SPG). The issue of loss of facilities should link back to points F and G in Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure. This will ensure that any loss of play or informal recreation space is managed effectively.

### **Policy S5 Sports and recreation facilities**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, the issue of the loss of facilities should link back to points F and G in Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure. This will ensure that any loss of sports or recreation facilities is managed effectively.

### **Policy S6 Public toilets**

LBN are supportive of the policy as it will push the development industry to increase the levels of accessibility of developments. The policy is also complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

LBN would suggest that the policy should also refer to bus/train/tube stations as places where free toilets are expected (particularly where station upgrades are being undertaken) to promote the accessibility of the transport network. This is particularly relevant in the absence of toilets on new trains such as those on the Elizabeth Line.

### **Policy S7 Burial space**

LBN are broadly supportive of the over-arching aim of this policy. However, there are some issues that should be addressed to ensure the policy deals effectively with the provision of burial space.

This policy creates a resource burden for Local Authorities due to the addition of further local evidence base requirements. This initiative, due to the scale and limited locational possibilities for new burial spaces, along with the need for sub-regional co-ordination, should be GLA led.

Policy point C needs to be caveated to include a reference to the requirement to demonstrate an identified need in the area and accounting for the amount of strategic provision in place in an area.

## **Chapter 6: Economy**

### **Policy E1 Offices**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan including the reference to the role of Royal Docks Enterprise Zone, whilst noting that most office growth in Newham will occur through extant planning consents and allocations.

### **Policy E2 Low-Cost Business Space**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, however, it would be useful to understand the rationale for the 2500 sq m benchmark in Part C and its suitability for all Major development.

It is also submitted that the Policy should be clearer about the value LCBS could bring to schemes in terms of avoidance of voids etc, and how particular designations can support its growth as well as protection given that otherwise anything in this policy is optional. It is also questioned why only B1 business space is to be protected, given that it may be in other uses. This is crucial to ensure ongoing development of space for a range of a range of business types, ensuring that they are not just meanwhile uses for creative and start up sector and have longevity to sustain and expand business.

### **Policy E3 Affordable Workspace**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly the promotion of the delivery of new workspace for creative industries, artists and the fashion industry. However, support should also be expressed affordable workspace for high technology manufacturing and digital industries. This is supported by LBN's own evidence which has seen increases in this demand in this sector.

In addition, Part F (affordable workspace occupied prior to residential occupation) is not necessarily universally appropriate given the need for cross-subsidy and viability constraints.

## **Policy E4 Land for Industry, Logistics and services to support London's economic function**

LBN are broadly supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, however LBN consider the policy needs to separate out the approach on Non-designated industrial sites, (which would also aid the clarity of Part C) which are non-designated for a reason: it is a very big ask to monitor and protect it all, and indeed, not all are positive contributors to wider place-making and good-growth objectives. The policy position on un-designated capacity is also unclear: protection but net loss is permitted?

Similarly, whilst it is positive to recognise the role of operational yardspace, it is ineffective to require no net loss of floorspace/yardspace within SIL/LSIS across the whole of London with no reference to property market areas and the need for co-ordination. The latter could for instance occur in a similar way to the management of housing capacity through the SHLAA. Presently it appears to be overly flexible and inviting a continued process of displacement without there being a mechanism to secure compensatory provision particularly across LPA boundaries. Further detail is also required as to how it will be monitored and managed as it is not clear how monitoring will occur in the face of the encouragement of intensification that preserves capacity over a smaller footprint. Reference to the process being 'plan-led' only would support this. Moreover, the universal exclusion from the 'no net loss' requirement of surplus utilities and transport land is unjustified: this could be a useful source of capacity for industrial renewal/expansion, and should only be released in a plan-led way when these needs have been addressed, in a similar way to the managed release of social infrastructure sites.

It is also suggested that the three categories (Table 6.2) and the continued reference to vacancy rates (para 6.4.4) is unhelpful particularly in East London in the context of increased housing targets which adds further pressure on industrial land (implying there all land with capacity/vacancy is open to release). It would be more useful to acknowledge that managed/limited release is already in train in a plan led way and that there is only limited scope for further release through plan review, and this should occur in relation to demand studies not vacancy rates, which still requires some new provision. The present naming of the categories suggest provision of capacity is only required in those boroughs in the 'provide' category.

Likewise, it is submitted that the retention and prioritisation criteria in section D fail to acknowledge the importance of protecting sub-optimal sites where well occupied in the context of a stressed land market (including displacement from elsewhere) where 'optimal' locations have been taken for housing.

As in Policy E2, clarification on the rationale behind the 2,500 benchmark in Part H as stated above would also be helpful.

## **Policy E5 Strategic Industrial Locations**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan particularly the reference to a plan-led

approach (E5.A) Agent of Change policy E5.E/D12) to ensure industrial activities are not compromised through new development.

### **Policy E6 Locally Significant Industrial Sites**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. The wording in 6.6.1 could however be strengthened recognising the inter-play/relationship between LSISs and SILs and their role in alleviating pressure on SIL as part of the reservoir of employment land to support economic growth.

### **Policy E7 Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly Policy J2 which seeks a plan-led and managed approach to employment land. LBN agree the management of industrial land should involve plan-led intensification and release.

However, as part of this, it would be helpful, similar to the annex on town centres with sector growth potential, to identify which SILs the GLA consider suitable for intensification. It would also be clearer to separate out industrial intensification and intensification that facilitates release for housing. In particular the former should be encouraged on all sites to secure additional industrial capacity (with appropriate safeguarding of functionality), and the latter in defined places given the difficulties of finding new industrial land. There should perhaps be a distinction between intensification on SILs and LSISs: the approach in Newham for instance is that certain LSISs have been identified as more appropriate for employment-led mixed use (Local Mixed Use Areas or LMUAs) rather than sole protection as industrial. These different categorisations are recognised as all working together to support growth and change.

It is also felt that co-location is not a particularly clear term, and clarification should be given as to in what circumstances and formats it is envisaged e.g. vertical mixed use, or closer proximity (side by side mixed use is not particularly new). Substitution is not that intuitive a term either – when what is actually being referred to is decentralisation or land-swapping. Generally Part F seems rather unworkable in light of other objectives such as air quality improvement, and disbenefits such as loss of local jobs and different service areas.

Parts D & E return to the issue of non-designated sites, which is confusing – again this would be better dealt with in one 'non-designated sites' policy. It is also unclear how it sits with Policy H2 on small sites, for example, the term 'underused' which would seem to weaken protection.

### **Policy E8 Sector growth opportunities and clusters**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan and its existing Economic Regeneration work.

## **Policy E9 Retail, markets and hot food takeaways**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly the additional dimension to our policy which restricts hot food takeaways based on cumulative impact. It is very useful for agendas such as this to be paused at the Pan-London level, and we would not wish to advance a local catchment. If it is decided that 400m applied to all schools is too exclusive, 400m around secondary schools would also have a significant impact.

As stated above it would be useful to understand the 2500 sqm threshold for the provision of small shops/commercial development as part of large-scale commercial development set out in E.9.E.

## **Policy E10 Visitor Infrastructure**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly the guidance on accessible bedrooms which is useful in setting development norms at the Pan-London level.

However Part F and the enabling approach in Part E could better acknowledge the issue of purpose built apart-hotels potentially displacing conventional housing capacity (i.e. sites) – as student housing as in recent years.

There also remains a need to avoid the pitfalls of unregulated growth of 'AirBnB' type accommodation use, which brings no jobs to the area; can negatively impact on the local community; and may encourage population transience. The policy does not seek to address this point or detail how this may be regulated managed though potential regulation across London.

## **Policy E11 Skills and Opportunities**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, LBN we disagree with the statement in paragraph 6.11.3: LBN never require an employer to dismiss an apprentice or any other staff member when they move to a site in the borough on the basis that the apprentice/staff member does not live in our Borough. We only ask that when new opportunities arise on the LBN site that the employer uses 'best endeavours' to fill that vacancy with a resident in the borough. There is never an expectation that employers will give someone a job because of their postcode. LBN would ask that employers place vacancies with Workplace to support local employment opportunities.

It is also recommended that the word “trainee” is replaced with “those undertaking training and/or apprenticeships” as “trainee” can be misinterpreted to mean unpaid or very low skilled staff member (E11.B).

## **Chapter 7: Heritage and Culture**

### **Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham’s Draft Revised Local Plan. However, structurally, having these policies divorced from design policies (HC1-4) is unhelpful

### **Policy HC2 World Heritage Sites**

No comment

### **Policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views**

LBN support this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham’s Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy HC4 London View Management Framework**

None of the designated views are within Newham. However, the policy at paragraph C states that development proposals in the background of a view should not harm the composition of the view as a whole. The requirement is repeated at paragraph F.3.

Manhattan Loft Gardens in Stratford and its intrusion on protected views of St Paul’s Cathedral from Richmond Park have provoked a controversy in Newham. The development was located not within the protected view from one point to the other but lay a considerable distance behind St Paul’s. The draft policy does not provide sufficient guidance as to how this situation should be managed, and the circumstances in which a building such as Manhattan Loft Gardens can be discounted as damaging a view.

### **Policy HC5 Support London’s Cultural and Creative Industries**

LBN supports the plans for enhancement and development of culture and creative industries as a key sector for economic growth and jobs for residents. The borough has a significant established creative cluster in Stratford with Theatre Royal Stratford, Stratford Circus, which is expanding with other creative organisations choosing to locate in the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. In addition, Newham is progressing development of creative and cultural offer in the Royal Docks Enterprise Zone including Canning Town and

Custom House and areas adjacent. The borough has identified need for affordable and low cost workspace and has built into current and future regeneration projects meanwhile and long term creative offer. LBN agrees that a broad diverse cultural offer is key to ensuring cohesive and asset to the community for all residents.

Notwithstanding the above, it is structurally unhelpful for this policy to be divorced from the Economy chapter. In addition, A:5 seems out of kilter with A1 – such venues should be in town centres or at least locations that are highly accessible by public transport.

### **Policy HC6 Supporting the night-time economy**

LBN support this policy and the recognition of the topic more generally, including the status of Stratford's night time economy and support to this afforded by the night tube. Extending night-time service to the DLR should also support the evolving offer in the Royal Docks.

Clarity is however required within the narrative of the policy/supportive statement to highlight that an enhanced night-time offer and longer opening hours should not introduce an undue negative impact on residential amenity. It is also necessary to emphasise that the night-time offer should be of high quality so that that such locations are safe and desirable destinations. The policy could be more explicit in reference to the Agent of Change principle to manage the relationship of differing land uses to support a high quality NTE, particularly to protect existing viable operations and promote high quality new development.

The policy also has an excessive focus on one type of night time economy, that based around culture/service industries, however, other types of economic activity are also underway at night. Night time transport is seen as necessary and a fundamental requirement for residents commuting to employment and future economic development of the borough (not just seen as a recreational offer). A significant proportion of travel on night tubes is from residents travelling to and from work. LBN supports the aspirations to ensure that services and offer is comprehensive to meet changing needs of the economy. This is particularly important for areas outside central London. LBN would welcome commitment to expansion of night time tubes across other lines, notably the District and Hammersmith and City Lines to serve East London.

Partly relating to the above, structurally this policy would therefore sit much better within the economy chapter (6). It is considered that it would broaden its scope to support a broader range of economic growth. The reason being that it would be compatible with other uses including industrial uses which are subject to similar considerations such as the 'agent of change' concept, and have evening and night-time operations as part of their business requirements.

### **Policy HC7 Protecting public houses**

In general Policy HC7 is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

It is noted that there is limited detail regarding preferred alternative uses. In the case of Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan (Policy 2b(iv)) there is a preference to protect the pubs for alternative community benefits which have a similar catchment. It is therefore recommended that Policy HC7 and the supporting statement is amended to seek the continuation of uses with community benefits where pubs are no longer viable.

It is also considered that this policy would be better located within the Social Infrastructure chapter of the Plan.

## **Chapter 8: Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment**

### **Policy G1 Green infrastructure**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, LBN query the added value of standalone 'green infrastructure strategies' when this should be integrated into Local Plans. Related to this, the link between point B and C is unclear.

### **Policy G2 London's Green Belt**

LBN object to the rigid protection of Green Belt in the absence of a comprehensive strategic Green Belt Review. The London Plan overall fails to recognise and address the impacts of this approach, such as:

- Continuing to direct development to other locations where it could be less sustainable due to increased pressures on already strained infrastructure capacity and affordable housing and other community benefits squeezed out by land values and decontamination costs and higher land values and viability considerations squeezing out affordable housing and other community benefits (see also related comments to policy GG2 & H1)
- Further privileging more affluent areas at the expense of less affluent areas, for instance, in inequitable promotion of access to green space and associated environmental quality (such as reduction in heat island effects).

In response, the policy could do more to address the strategic principle of linking areas of MOL and GB through for instance the strategic deployment of green wedges.

### **Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land**

LBN are supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. Reference to ability to land swap is particularly welcomed as a useful response to changing land use contexts.

### **Policy G4 Local green and open space**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

Given overlaps with policy G1, the two could be integrated. As commented under policy G1, LBN query value of separate 'green infrastructure strategies.

### **Policy G5 Urban greening**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy, including the introduction of the urban greening factor, which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, the need to develop local approaches to UGF is questioned, particularly given the related resource impact. A pan-London only approach may be more appropriate, but should be kept under review to ensure it remains effective, given the danger of planning by numbers diluting the intent

Para A should also reference the requirement for long term maintenance commitments. Again, considering what boroughs are asked of, this policy could be better expressed in an integrated GI policy.

### **Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy, including the introduction of the urban greening factor, which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. The reference to support with and procedures relating to designation and protection of SINC's is welcomed.

However, LBN question the relevance of the 'Areas of deficiency in access to nature' as opposed to a more general net biodiversity increase approach, given potential conflict between increased use and biodiversity protection.

### **Policy G7 Trees and woodlands**

LBN are supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

## **Policy G8 Food growing**

LBN are generally supportive of this policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, A.2 could additionally recognise the opportunity and role of industrial sheds (e.g. aquaponics agriculture) in food growing, particularly in contaminated areas.

Additionally, more guidance on identifying areas for commercial food production would be welcomed.

## **Chapter 9: Sustainable Infrastructure**

### **Policy SI1 – Improving Air Quality**

LBN generally support this policy given the clear need to improve London's air quality. However, given the opportunity presented by a Pan-London policy that sets new development norms, we have some concerns over the effectiveness of AQN+AQP policy firstly, given that it is based on last lawful use (part 5) given the amount of brownfield land that is now unused or underused (and causes no air quality harm) the policy could perversely result in a worsening of AQ.

Secondly, the policy misses an opportunity to set specific and meaningful actions. It would be more effective if the London Plan prescribed or referenced expected minimum standards, as it does for example with housing design. This could include ultralow NOx combustion or equivalent on all development. Leaving it as a target based approach just leads to consultants arguing over the likely impact of a development with LPAs under-resourced to counter these arguments. Any guidance produced (as referenced in 9.1.11) should include assessment templates to help standardise approach across London and minimise developer pushback.

### **Policy SI2 Minimising Greenhouse gas emissions**

LBN generally support this policy given the clear need to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and the role of the London Plan in stretching the development industry to meet new challenges such as Zero-Carbon for non-resi by 2019. It is useful to refer to both peak energy and annual energy demand as benchmarks, and welcome the specification of 35% on site contributions.

We also welcome the definition of Pan-London offset price and subsequently increases, in the absence of capacity to do such work locally. With this in mind, we would also support however, a pan-London offset fund with local quotas: rather than multiple variants being set up with divergent rules on additionality etc., subject to borough involvement in design and implementation. This could usefully complement other GLA funding, and achieve efficiencies in administration.

It is however peculiar that there is only the possibility that further guidance will be produced ('may produce additional guidance'): this is too non-committal for instance in relation to performance monitoring and reporting and in relation to costs assessment (Part k). It is unclear what weight should be given to each consideration.

In addition, it may be useful to re-focus the remit of Energy Assessments which this policy appears to consider to be expansive. It could be argued for instance that some issues would warrant more attention through separate policy consideration e.g. re carbon in construction (which may in turn relate better to Circular Economy policy).

### **Policy SI3 – Energy Infrastructure**

In general LBN are supportive of this policy and it is deemed to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

Policy SI13 sets out local authority and developer requirements. It is not clear what part the GLA will play in achieving the aims and objectives of this policy and therefore this should be addressed. For instance, OAPFs could be a useful vehicle through which to do energy masterplanning, a useful place to add value in the absence of local expertise.

It is noted that there is an absence of support for exploring innovative energy technologies. The policy should take a more pro-active and future proofed stance in supporting innovation.

### **Policy S14 Managing Heat Risk**

LBN is supportive of this policy and it is considered to be complementary to the Draft Revised Local Plan. Of particular note is the inclusion of a 'cooling hierarchy which sets out a clear and logical process for addressing the issue of overheating.

### **Policy SI5 Water infrastructure**

LBN is supportive of this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

The scope of the policy could be broadened by setting out requirements and measures to reduce leakages. Furthermore it would be helpful if the GLA could set out their role in brokering increases to supply and capacity to reflect development opportunities.

### **Policy SI6 Digital connectivity infrastructure**

LBN is supportive of this policy and it is considered to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

### **Policy SI7 Reducing Waste and supporting the circular economy**

The overall strategic premise of its policy, and the potential of the Circular Economy is supported by LBN, however it is noted that targets and monitoring in this field are problematic. Targets for (newly added) 'municipal waste' (household and commercial) will be impossible to monitor as the only readily

available data (from the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator) combines household, industrial, and commercial data under the 'HIC' category. The GLA and EA should resolve this inconsistency to enable effective monitoring of the policy. Similarly, targets may need to be reviewed in light of success of circular economy concept (which should see less of certain recyclable materials presenting as waste reducing scope for recycling due to re-use). Likewise, it should be noted that the ability of boroughs to contribute to recycling targets will vary, as for some, like Newham, the targets are very challenging (e.g. due to lots of flats and associated lower amounts of green waste arising from gardens) so it is suggested that the targets are applied to London as a whole.

### **Policy SI8 Waste capacity and net waste sufficiency**

Given the ambitious aims of net self sufficiency the Mayor needs to make clear what is required in terms of treatment facilities, if only in broad terms, to meet the target of net self-sufficiency by 2026. It needs to be built on an inventory of London's existing treatment facilities and the areas of strength that London has where it manages more than arisings. Table 9.3 does not paint a particularly useful picture about exports; the GLA's own technical reports make clear that large amounts of different types of waste will still cross administrative borders even if the net self-sufficiency target is reached. It would be useful if the table showed imports to London and included more than just household and C&I waste.

Moreover, the plan should be based on best-available data. The C&I methodology is for instance, based on a methodology that is 8 years out of date, using results from the 2009 Defra survey (withdrawn by Defra in 2015). This is highly likely to have over-estimated that C&I waste arisings as compared to the 2014 Defra methodology which replaced it, meaning in turn that waste planning authorities will need to identify more land than would be required to meet their apportionment targets.

The requirement (at B1) for development plans to 'identify how waste will be reduced... and how remaining quantum of waste will be managed' is overly onerous. The major part of any waste reduction strategy will take place outside the planning system and involve the co-ordination of numerous approaches / bodies / policies, at local, national, and international level. Planning's function is concerned with ensuring new development takes into account the need to move waste up the hierarchy, the London Plan should phrase the expectations for development plans accordingly.

There is also confusion in policy SI8 about how boroughs should demonstrate that sufficient land is identified to meet their apportionment. Recent experience in London and the rest of England demonstrates that few landowners and operators put forward sites for waste use as part of a call for sites. As a result it is increasingly necessary for planning authorities to identify areas of search in which suitable sites for waste use may come forward rather than being able to identify precise land parcel availability and appropriateness.. It would not be reasonable therefore for the Mayor to insist on the allocation of sites to demonstrate that there is sufficient amount of land allocated to future waste management. The interface with waste contract

procurement, particularly for municipal waste needs to articulated better: rather than planning by numbers: realities such as disposal costs, transport impacts, recycling incentives in contracts, and difficulties with transforming recycling behaviours need to be better explored. Paragraph 9.8.8 is also unclear in its reference to large scale redevelopment opportunities incorporating waste management facilities within them: is this envisaged only in relation to large scale redevelopment on SIL or all locations, and is the reference to waste management facilities referring to waste management for the proposal in question or wider strategic need?

### **Policy SI9 Safeguarded waste sites**

This policy would seem to be problematic for a number of reasons, firstly in light of difficulties presented by the previous policy, and cross boundary co-ordination, (waste plans being usually multi-borough tasks, and further requiring Duty to Co-operate work over a wide area) the requirement to have an adopted waste plan before even considering the loss of waste sites, particularly those that have never been activated and no commercial interest in them, is very inflexible. Indeed it can be the case that such sites reflect dated apportionments which have since reduced. It would be more appropriate to specify that alternative means of providing for necessary capacity have been demonstrated, and to acknowledge the relationship with plan-led employment land review which can occur more straightforwardly in individual borough Local Plans, albeit still necessarily involving Duty to Co-operate conversations. Indeed, the overall largely static presumption set out by this policy sits poorly with the methodology in the LILD (London Industrial Land Demand Study) for projecting industrial land demand-based requirements, which seems to imply an overall downward trend in spatial requirements for waste-related uses due to ongoing efficiencies – albeit this methodology appears problematic in its own right given a poor relationship with on the ground spatial realities. Thirdly, the policy fails to acknowledge the GLA's role as a major landowner in planning for such provision (given that some safeguarded sites fall on its land) and facilitating and swaps in some areas. Fourthly, the interface with planning for net self-sufficiency needs clarifying, given that in some industrial areas such as Newham, sites are handling significant flows from outside of London not acknowledged in the waste apportionment figure, and contrary to the proximity principle.

### **Policy SI 10 Aggregates**

LBN have no comment on this policy as it is not a Minerals Planning Authority other than to submit that it is not appropriate for the recycling target to include excavation waste which is of a very different nature and not achievable: it is noted that the Technical report states that 3.7mT of inert waste went to landfill in 2015. This is because, as a result of the Methley decision, the Environment Agency has had to change its regulations covering waste recovery on land, and what was previously considered recycling is now considered landfill. As such, schemes like Wallasea Island which took construction spoil from Crossrail are now less likely to happen. It is suggested instead that the

management of Excavation waste should be specifically listed as a topic to be discussed with the WSE RTABs in paragraph 9.8.3.

### **Policy SI11 Hydraulic fracking**

No comment.

### **Policy SI12 Flood Risk Management**

LBN in general support this policy, given that it is complementary to policies to manage flood risk in Newham. However, it is submitted that the paragraph 9.12.4 incorrectly states that the LLFAs are responsible for Riverside Strategies, rather it is a responsibility of the Local Authority to translate the concept into Local Plans and other strategies.

It is also observed that the EA frequently comments that Local Plans should be demanding more funding from developers for long-term (TE2100) flood defence upgrades. While the role and responsibility of riparian owners is understood, the fluvial and tidal flood risk in London are huge strategic issues, such that neither individual developers, nor individual Local Authorities should be responsible for funding and co-ordinating the necessary response to these risks in an uncoordinated way. It would therefore add useful strategic value to planning for development and community safety of the GLA were to work more closely with the EA to address these threats and coordinate the London-wide.

### **Policy SI13 Sustainable Drainage**

LBN support this policy, but submit that the sentence at 9.13.1 should be revised to give a more accurate representation of the LLFA's role: *'Lead Local Flood Authorities have responsibility for managing surface water drainage through the planning system, as well as maintenance arrangements'*. The LLFA are not responsible for the direct management and certainly not maintenance of surface water drainage systems: reference to the duties created by the 2010 Flood and Water Management Act should be made.

In addition, for consistency across London, the plan should specify how it expects greenfield run-off to be calculated. A more precise definition should be provided since for example, 'undeveloped site' means different things to different people and soil type (affecting calculation outcomes) is often done arbitrarily / inconsistently. The Newham Local Plan references the DEFRA / EA report Rainfall runoff management for developments (SC030219) published October 2013.

### **Policy SI14 Waterways – strategic role**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, the London Plan would have an important role in ensuring consistency related to strategic objectives, and as such this policy should be detailed further.

### **Policy SI15 Water Transport**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Local Plan, particularly greater emphasis on protection of river transport capacity, sustainable freight and reference to the Agent of Change Principle to manage potential conflicting land uses. However, we submit it would be better situated within the transport chapter with cross references from this chapter.

### **Policy SI16 Water use and enjoyment**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Local Plan, particularly recognising opportunities to enhance use of the waterways, with emphasis on protecting and enhancing the character. However, we suggest that it is inappropriate for the only considerations in relation to moorings to be navigation and the character of the waterways, without reference to the character of adjacent sites, SIL compatibility/residential suitability and biodiversity for instance (SI16.D.1-2)

Likewise, the promotion of cultural, educational and community facilities along waterways (Point C) – should be in line with other strategic principles for these uses (e.g. accessibility, town centre policy, need, night time economy) unless what is being proposed is specifically water-related.

### **Policy SI17: Protecting London's waterways**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, Paragraph D should also recognise the need for crossings to improve connectivity across water surfaces.

## **Chapter 10: Transport**

### **Policy T1 Strategic Approach to Transport**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly around more space efficient travel and overall more sustainable modal shift.

We note the target is ambitious, and particularly in relation to adequate resourcing/strategic plans for East London (notably in the light of expected population growth in the east). It is important to note, further details on strategic transport matters are set out LBN's formal response to Mayor's Transport Strategy.

## **Policy T2 Healthy Streets**

Generally LBN are fully supportive of the policy and the approach that underpins the transport policy and links to other objectives such as health, which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, particularly around cross cutting policies/themes that seek to promote healthy and quality as a key component of the strategy in which Healthy Streets is supported.

Further detail is however needed on the implementation, particularly where some of the indicators are not particularly relevant to a scheme, and recommended to be applied flexibly. LBN would request clarification as to whether any of the 10 indicators should be prioritised for instance.

The policy could also more explicitly reference improved public transport journey times (particularly bus reliability) as a key outcome of T2.B.1. Whilst this is recognised as a key barrier to movement, this is particularly important at a strategic level that growth does not impact public transport reliability which has knock on impacts on peoples sustainable travel impacts.

## **Policy T3 Transport Capacity, connectivity and safeguarding**

Whilst it is noted the policy is not a significant departure from the previous plan, however, the amalgamation of capacity, connectivity and safeguarding is welcomed under one policy recognising the interplay between the themes. In relation to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan It is important that the policy will need to ensure there are sufficient transport infrastructure commitments to meet growth particularly in areas such as Beckton/Royal Docks and to address capacity to support delivery in this area.

LBN raise one concern in relation T3.B.1-3 to safeguarding it is particularly important to point out in the policy which appears to be open-endedly seeking security for transport, without a firm commitment to decision-making timescales/delivery and design that links to the 'optimisation' agenda around efficient use of land.

In relation to the transport schemes set out in 10.1, LBN broadly support these and need to ensure the transport provision must be secured to meet emerging demand (which will have implications on the delivery of new development). Further details on strategic transport matters are set out in LBN's formal response to the Mayor's Draft Transport Strategy. However the following comments should be considered in relation to these schemes:

- **Bus Network Silvertown Tunnel** – support of this subject to their being no significant deterioration of other bus services and public transport opportunities in the area
- **Bus Transit OAs** – Supportive of this project subject to there being no significant deterioration of other bus services or public transport opportunities in the area. With the growth expected in the Royal Docks a higher level of bus capacity is required to meet the anticipated growth.
- **DLR Extension from Gallions' Reach to Thamesmead** – Need to consider the impacts of this proposal in relation to demand before it meets LBN, and is dependant on precise passenger impacts/numbers.

The timescale given is also very broad (2017-30) and it would be helpful to indicate milestones within it.

- **DLR Night Services** – supportive of this in principle in particular to support the growth demands and existing employment opportunities particularly in the Royal Docks
- **Improved Interchanges as Stratford:** Supportive of this but must address urgently the significant overcrowding/capacity issues at this station.
- **Crossrail 2** – Lack of commitment for Crossrail 2 Eastern Branch however, it needs to be examined the possibility of growth in the East Sub region to support growth in this area.
- **River crossings** – there are various references to these which should be brought together as a package. As noted above, the relative merits of additional road crossing in east London should be examined sooner than the timescale indicated (not until 2030-41).

### **Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, and welcomes the requirement for Transport Assessments to measure compatibility with Healthy Streets.

LBN also particularly support points T4.D-E concerning consideration for active travel promotion, impacts on transport capacity by development and the factors around the cumulative impacts and road safety as their impacts on the transport system.

### **Policy T5 Cycling**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

LBN welcome the flexibility within residential cycle parking provision, and wish to emphasise good quality cycle parking rather than quantities. However, LBN consider the policy is not balanced enough in the approach recognising the inter-play between cycle ownership and parking provision. Overall the policy approach need to strike a balance between quantity and quality to support the uptake in cycling across London. As such the policy need to be amended to recognise the following points:

- Increasing option of cycle hire/membership schemes and more explicitly be worded to recognise the wider range of cycle schemes, including encouraging on street rather than within buildings/communal (and supported in space standards to reflect this)
- In relation to Policy T5A1. And 10.5.1 (relating to route infrastructure) is very brief and should be more detailed setting out the commitments to the expanded 'network of strategic cycle routes' across London.
- In relation to Outer London Boroughs, there is a need for modal shift there too, and there should be no difference in the ability to achieve this for local trips, if anything cycling in outer London is more attractive, and could play an important role in unlocking people's access to wider areas/car parking reliance.

### **Policy T6 Car Parking**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy, that seeks to strengthen car free/light development which is generally complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However at 10.6.1 it should be noted that the dominance of vehicles (notably cars) on the streets is a significant barrier to not just walking and cycling but also impacts bus reliability/journey times.

It is also submitted that (at 10.6.4) the level of car parking should also be considered against car sharing opportunities in the area (e.g. car clubs etc. Overall moreover, the policy needs to identify the link with ongoing divergent standards in Outer London boroughs and beyond and network loading in inner London. The strengthening of car free in London may cumulatively impact Outer London car parking and potential increases. Will this support the 80% of all trips in London by sustainable modes.

### **Policy T6.1 Residential Parking**

LBN conditionally support this policy which is broadly complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan, with support for a stronger residential car-free development stance in highly accessible locations. It should be noted the majority of the borough is proposed to be subject to 'car free' maximum standards, (Table 10.3) which local experience suggests however is not appropriate, and a nuanced approach is better, factoring in PTAL, local car ownership and site context). LBN is particularly unique as an Inner London Borough, in that some areas assessed as PTAL 4 reflect the characteristics of Outer London, and it may not be appropriate to support car-free in these locations, in which a scheme by scheme approach set by LBN would be appropriate. This issue may further be compounded in that as the approach reflects accessibility only, it does not reflect housing type, for example promotion of three bed family housing in these locations in policy (which may require access to a car).

T6.1.G.1 (disabled persons parking) could also be clearer in setting out what it is trying to achieve for Major developments. Put simply are disabled parking bays required for 3% of the overall number of residential units? Further clarity is needed on minimum levels of parking where otherwise car-free,

There also appears to be lack of recognition of the operational and servicing vehicles used to service major residential developments and their parking requirements, which can often cause access problems.

### **Policy T6.2 Office Parking**

LBN conditionally support this policy which is broadly complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. It should be noted the majority of the borough is subject to 'car free' maximum standards, which has some implications in relation to the local standards approach set out in the Draft Revised Local Plan.

Parking policy for B2/B8 uses however should be separated from office parking policy, for example as 'non residential parking' (T6.2) as the nature of parking requirements for offices and commercial B2/B8 is different (including

shift work 24 hours a day), and may present further challenges in people's access to employment.

It is also important to highlight that B2/B8 car parking should be applied flexibly (T6.2C). In large areas of existing and protected SIL (and in Newham's context Local Industrial Locations) with varying PTALs it may not be appropriate for car-free on these sites.

### **Policy T7 Freight and Servicing**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy with greater emphasis on facilitating sustainable freight and servicing through reduced trips and emissions and out of peak deliveries which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, T7.E is noted as a particularly difficult test to follow (criteria 1-4) as it is unlikely to be able to delivery a modal shift (to rail or water) in all consolidation/distribution schemes, particularly noting the increasing pressures to support deliveries (including those with 'in-time' requirements) whereby rail or water may not be achievable.

### **Policy T8 Aviation**

LBN are generally supportive of the policy which is complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan. However, it is submitted that there should be a commitment to no new airports unless expansion of existing airports is found not to be suitable. In this regard, it is noted that technological improvements to aircraft, etc, could mean that noise levels are actually reduced (as in current planning permission at LCY). This should not be used as a reason for further expansion. Rather, there should be support for reduction in environmental harm instead of no worsening (point I 'additional environmental harm'). There should be a commitment, when assessing the effects of proposals for additional aviation capacity, to including the cumulative effect of existing and proposed levels of noise, air quality, etc. We would expect that any mitigation required as the result of other airports' expansion be consistent with those in force at LCY. In relation to heliports (Point J) this should include reference to a presumption against temporary uses as well as permanent sites.

Similarly, whilst making use of existing spare capacity is supported in principle, points E and G, should bear in mind that surface access improvements (even with sustainable modes, which it is noted, should include walking – LCY can be accessed on foot) can result in environmental disbenefits. There is also no mention of the impact of aviation on biodiversity: it should be acknowledged that this is adversely affected by the proximity of airports (risk of bird strike) but that this should not be an excuse not to enhance biodiversity, rather that appropriate species/specifications will be limited.

## **Policy T9 Funding Transport Infrastructure through planning**

LBN are conditionally supportive of the policy. Whilst it is recognised that the Mayoral CIL (MCIL) will secure funding for potential Crossrail 2, LBN consider the policy should be clearer on its commitments for 'other transport infrastructure' as part of the policy and reflect projects set out in the Draft Mayors Transport Strategy (implementation Plan). LBN would wish to reiterate that the Draft revised Local Plan reflects on the LBN's Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support growth, and this is particularly important to reflect significant growth ambitions in areas such as Royal Docks and Beckton.

## **Chapter 11: Funding the London Plan**

### **Policy DF1 Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations**

In general LBN are supportive of this policy and it is deemed to be complementary to Newham's Draft Revised Local Plan.

However, policy DF1 prioritises affordable housing and strategic transport over other infrastructure. It is not considered that this is necessarily the most effective approach due to the broad range of variables in any development proposal. It is recommended that consideration is given to assessing the need on a case by case basis.

There are also concerns about whether the current mechanisms for ensuring the provision of infrastructure are sufficient. The GLA, and LBN have identified a significant funding gap for infrastructure projects and scheme viability cannot be expected to bear it all. It is therefore suggested that alternative options are explored to fill the funding gap. Joint working on the forward funding potential of business rates retention is underway; greater flexibilities over right to buy receipts and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing should also be the focus of discussions with the Treasury.

## **Chapter 12: Monitoring**

### **Policy M1 Monitoring**

The objectives in **M1 monitoring** to improve the monitoring of development in London can be welcomed. However, the impact of any monitoring requirements on LPAs needs careful consideration in the context of already over-stretched resources. LBN welcome the approach that has for instance evolved with the GLA Town Centre Healthchecks where the GLA collates and disseminates a range of core data for all town centres, and asks for borough supplementary information on only a few areas.